



South Mountain Corridor Study Citizens Advisory Team Meeting Summary

Date: January 5, 2006
Time: 5:30 p.m.
Location: District 6 Komatke Center, Learning Center Meeting Hall

CAT Members Attending:

Rock Argabright, Ahwatukee Foothills Chamber of Commerce
Laurel Arndt, Ahwatukee Foothills Village Planning Committee
Kris Black, Ahwatukee Foothills HOA
Steve Boschen, Valley Forward
Jim Buster, Avondale
Clayton Danzeisen, Maricopa County Farm Bureau

Peggy Eastburn, Estrella Village Planning Committee
Michael Goodman, Phoenix Mountains Preservation Council
Don Jones, Southwest Valley Chamber of Commerce
Bob Moss, United Dairymen of Arizona
Michelle Pulich-Stewart, Sierra Club
Jim Stroger, Kyrene Lagos Elementary School
Anthony Villareal, GRIC District 6

Staff and Consultants:

Jack Allen, HDR
Mike Bruder, ADOT
Kelly Cairo, GCI
Ken Davis, FHWA
Amy Edwards, HDR

Fred Garcia, ADOT
Theresa Gunn, GCI
Bill Hayden, ADOT
Don Herp, COP
Kelly Kading, HDR

Michael LaBianca, HDR
Dan Lance, ADOT
Roger Roy, MAG
Ben Spargo, HDR
Bill Vachon, FHWA

Citizens:

Thomas Alvarado
Michelle Eastburn
David Folts
Ralph Guariglio
Jim Jochim
Wade Kempton

Larry Lee
Matthew Alan Lord
Doug Murphy
Melanie Pai
Daniel D. Pinkstaff
Teri Pinkstaff

Kwalin Pipkin
Corinne Purtill
William Ramsay
David Roberts
Dave Swisher
David Underwood

ACTION PLAN

Task/Activity	Who	When
Review Social Conditions report regarding "The character of Ahwatukee would not be affected." Is this accurate?	Amy Edwards	

Welcome

Theresa Gunn welcomed attendees and explained that comments from public attendees are accepted in writing. All questions and comments are read at the end of the meeting, and if possible, responses are provided at that time.

Anthony Villareal announced his withdrawal from the CAT pending further direction from the governor-elect. Gunn thanked him for his participation and for the hospitality provided by District 6 at the Komatke Center.

CAT Member Questions and Comments:

Question: What is the situation regarding the Lakewood HOA seat on the CAT?

Response: We have contacted the association requesting a replacement. Though the manager plans to address the issue at the next HOA board meeting at the end of January, we have encouraged the association to provide a replacement sooner than this timeframe. We have three other requests regarding joining the committee and will discuss these toward the conclusion of the meeting.

Project Update

Amy Edwards provided follow-up information to CAT questions regarding the project. She provided information regarding the level of groundwater Laveen, which was shown to be between 32 and 53 feet. The source of the data is the Arizona Department of Water Resources, and the information was collected from 1991-2005. She also reviewed the business map and employment center maps, and 32nd Street displacements.

CAT Member Questions and Comments:

Comment (Regarding groundwater levels): In 1992-93, I found groundwater in that area to come up to 15-20 feet. **Response:** The area may have experienced a perched groundwater aquifer, which is a localized area of water that is not part of a regular aquifer.

Question: Would we expect to see aquifers drop in the future? **Response:** That would be hard to predict. The information presented here is current.

Comment (Regarding the business map): I would like to see where the schools are on Pecos.

Technical Report Review

Edwards introduced Michael LaBianca and Kelly Kading, HDR, and Fred Garcia, ADOT, who addressed technical questions. Reports reviewed included Hazardous Materials, Land Use, and Noise Analysis.

Hazardous materials are categorized as low, mid, and high priority sites by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality. Edwards reviewed information regarding high priority sites within the study area.

CAT Member Questions and Comments:

Question: If a contaminated aquifer is disturbed by depressing a freeway in the area, will it contaminate the soil? **Response:** The West Van Buren Water Quality Assurance Revolving Fund (WQARF) Site is not in the Laveen area. Additionally, the depth of the water at that site is 50-60 feet and would not be affected by a freeway. Although the site is considered a high priority, it has a low concentration of contaminants that do not transfer to soil easily. Should ADOT need to disturb this type of area, they contact experts who detect, handle and dispose of contaminants.

Question: What is the cost for mitigating disturbed contaminated water? **Response:** That would depend on many factors.

Question: Would transport of hazardous materials on the freeway be restricted, as they are in the SR101/SR202 area? **Response:** The restriction in that area is due to the bridge and river area.

Question: There is not a line item for mitigation of hazardous materials? **Response:** Cost estimates at this level include a contingency for such items. A more detailed cost analysis is prepared later in the process.

Question: Would transport of hazardous materials on the freeway be restricted in crossing the Salt River, and would there be different restrictions when the river is dry or running? **Response:** Hazardous cargo will be addressed later in the process but is not restricted at normal bridge crossings.

Comment: This report should include information about what is considered a high priority.

Question: What are the names of the chemicals? **Response:** This is listed in the full report. Mike Bruder can be contacted to discuss full reports.

Question: Which contaminants fall into the high, mid and low priorities? **Response:** Priority status is not based on contaminants; it is based on ADEQ risk level assessments.

Comment: This report should have included more detailed information, such as contaminants, for each of the 18 sites in the study area. *(Please see related comment card.)*

Question: What are the surface contaminants at the pesticide site? **Response:** This is listed in the full report. Please contact Mike Bruder.

Question: How many groundwater wells in the area were shut down due to TCE? **Response:** Only those related to the West Van Buren WQARF Site. Additionally, Peggy Eastburn noted that she is a member of the West Van Buren WQARF Site Citizen Advisory Group, and that due to recent rains, water levels are rising and many wells are expected to be in service again in the future.

Edwards reviewed a land use table and map showing current land use vs. land use as zoned at this time.

CAT Member Questions and Comments:

Question: Do you use estimates for land purchase based on current conditions or the zoned use? **Response:** We look at right of way acquisition for existing and approved plats, though we do know this information may change. Land values are set under state law at the highest and best use.

Comment: I heard that the Calabrea development was contacted by ADOT and appraisers and that this is now part of the study process.

Question: How do you prepare for the changes that will occur in three years, which is when an actual offer would be made? **Response:** Right-of-way purchase is one of the most volatile estimates in this process. Residential values are based on the sale of similar properties within a one to two mile area.

Comment: It seems inappropriate that the Regional Transportation Plan would be updated each 20 years; whereas city land use plans are updated each five or 10 years.

Response: The RTP is updated annually, and the long-range plan is updated as need.

Reply: The map here shows that the RTP was updated in 2001 and affirms the 1985 plan.

Comment: GRIC has updated the borderland study. **Response:** This is not yet finalized. When the borderland study is finalized and GRIC releases it to us, we can include this information in the study. There is no timetable to receive the document, which is a GRIC information document, not an ADOT document.

Question: What is the difference between open space and undeveloped land? **Response:** In the 1998 GRIC Borderland Study, there are areas where the future land use is identified as “open space.” Public and quasi-public areas such as parks are considered open space.

Question: What is included as acreage? **Response:** Acres that would be a part of any footprint are included for each alternative. South Mountain Park and Preserve acreage is included in the E1 alternative.

Comment: GRIC cultural sites are not mentioned in land use impacts. **Response:** This information is listed in another report.

Comment: On p. 4, the third bullet should read “...state law exempted...”

Question: What does, “Consider fee simple purchase of incompatible uses” mean as found on p.5 in the first bullet? **Response:** This means the actual outright purchase of land.

Question: I heard that if land is taken from parklands, the park must be condemned.

Response: In the case of South Mountain Park and Preserve, which falls under Section 4(f), the section of the park affected would be condemned. Additionally, the city is not allowed to sell land for transportation purposes.

Question: The Palo Verde Group of the Sierra Club believes in the no-build option, in part because it would create a major impediment to wildlife. However, it seems right that if park land is taken away, park land should be added elsewhere. **Response:** We are working with the City of Phoenix on possible mitigation. Providing compensation land has not been ruled out.

Comment: I had hoped to hear West Valley voices on the issue of land use and planning which has been based on the 1988 alignment (p. 4, second bullet). **Response:** The Estrella Village plan shows a core area. However, there are many loopholes and changes in zoning and the general plan that occur over time.

Comment: I think it would be appropriate for the charts for land use conversion on the west side charts to reflect the South Mountain Park acres that are part of E1.

Edwards reviewed the noise barrier location process and introduced Fred Garcia, ADOT, to address questions related to noise.

CAT Member Questions and Comments:

Question: Are noise barriers constructed for existing or future uses? **Response:** We plan barriers for 20 years into the future from the time we finalize the noise analysis. This includes projects with permits as of the approval date.

Question: What about areas like Laveen that are expected to have a lot of growth, but won't have the permits in place at the time? **Response:** Development continues, and we must have an equitable time for responsibility for mitigation. Also, we don't want to build noise barriers in an area that doesn't get developed. The developer of any future project will be responsible for noise barriers.

Question: What is the "stopping line" for barriers? **Response:** This has in part to do with the overlap of the angles of barriers to prevent noise from going around the barrier.

Question: Are developers responsible for building sound barriers? **Response:** Developers have to abide by city requirements. Some cities have adopted ordinances to require mitigation to ADOT standards.

Question: Is rubberized asphalt to be used? **Response:** Rubberized asphalt is now ADOT's standard.

Question: What is the status of the elevation of the freeway through South Mountain Park? Won't an at-grade freeway block water flow and animal movements? **Response:** An at-grade freeway would be built to allow for water flow. Wildlife connectivity will be addressed in the biology report.

Question: How does depressing a freeway compare to one at-grade regarding noise? **Response:** The ground absorbs some energy (noise). When a freeway is depressed, it creates a sound shadow and it can be louder a few hundred feet away.

Question: Other than walls and rubberized asphalt, how else can sound be mitigated? **Response:** The surface treatment, rubberized asphalt, attacks 75 percent of the noise source and a 5 decibel reduction is generally anticipated with the treatment. Barriers can be walls or berms; however, berms require about 60-70 additional feet of right-of-way. Walls are typically 14-20 feet high as measured from the freeway side of the wall.

Question: Will there be a rebound effect with noise due to the hills and ridgelines? **Response:** We model for these situations with bounce back of energy. When a hill is about 100 feet away, energy is lost along the way.

Question: What about the road along Liberty, which is near significant hills? **Response:** Modeling methodology is quite sensitive to elevations and ground conditions. It is not possible to give specifics because so much data is necessary to create an accurate model.

Comment: I would like to have seen the decibel value along the current roadway. **Response:** There is existing noise data from within the last year at 44 locations in the noise report. We used this data to create the charts shown. As the design is refined, there will be further changes, however.

Question: I would like to see the full noise report. **Response:** The process is to notify Mike Bruder.

Comment: If the no-build option carries through, I would like to know what the City of Phoenix will do to mitigate noise along Pecos.

Question: Is there noise mitigation for construction-related impacts, such as blasting?

Response: ADOT does not have a policy for noise mitigation regarding these impacts.

Question: Can we meet the 64 db level on a South Mountain Freeway? **Response:** There are very few situations where ADOT cannot meet this policy. Walls primarily serve people closest to the freeway. At 300 feet, a wall does very little.

Question: Why is the 32nd Street intersection still on the map? **Response:** We are still working on updating maps.

Edwards provided follow up information to questions asked regarding previous reports.

CAT Member Questions and Comments:

Question: In the Social Conditions report, it reads that “The character of Ahwatukee will not be affected.” I think this is inaccurate and should be readdressed. **Response:** We will look at this.

SMCAT Evaluation Process

Gunn explained that in conference with her peers regarding the Co-Nexus process and the South Mountain project, she received the suggestion to evaluate the build options based on the known criteria, and then as a separate process evaluate the selected build option vs. a no-build option. She called for comments on whether this was an acceptable approach to the evaluation process.

CAT Member Questions and Comments:

Comment: This is a good method for comparison.

Comment: We do not have enough concrete information.

Comment: It could be perceived that the group supports a certain route, when it really prefers a no-build.

Comment: I thought no-build would remain an option throughout the process.

Comment: It may look disingenuous to take no-build out of the vote.

Comment: This would be a way to narrow three alternatives to one.

Question: What would the timeline be? After we pick one of the three alternatives, when will ADOT come back to us to ask us to compare a preferred alternative to a no-build?

Comment: I would like the two processes done at the same time.

I can't separate the concept of a no-build as a west-side alternative.

Comment: A “no” on the west site is difficult to vote for without east side information.

Comment: We should pick a west side alternative. What if there is a GRIC alternative at some point in the future.

Comment: Let's choose a west side alternative and discuss no-build later.

Comment: I agree. We need to understand that we don't know what a GRIC option would be.

Comment: The west side needs information.

Comment: The Sierra Club supports the no-build alternative. (Please see the statement read by Michelle Pulich-Stewart at the end of the meeting notes.) We can make a west side choice, but must make it clear that no-build is still an option.

Comment: I would like a timeline from GRIC as far as moving forward.

Comment: It is possible that none of the west side options are good. **Response:** Opportunities to select and shift alternatives have been available throughout the process, such as the shift in the Santa Maria Area.

Comment: We need a west side decision. We can talk about no-build later.

Comment: I agree. We need west side information sooner for planning purposes.

Comment: It is important that the west side understands that no-build remains an option. I don't want to wait nine months to evaluate no-build vs. a preferred alternative.

Comment: We should select a west side alternative. I am concerned about waiting on no-build; because we all know the only east option is Pecos. **Response:** There is no timeline set with GRIC; therefore, we can't give the SMCAT a definite date.

Gunn noted that consensus indicated that the group would evaluate a west side alternative, continue discussion on no-build, and that it must be clearly communicated that no-build remains an option. There were no dissenting comments.

CAT Membership

Gunn updated the group on membership requests. As noted previously, Lakewood HOA has an existing seat, but has not provided a new member to fill the position. In addition, the Woodside neighborhood disagrees with the CAT's previous decision and continues to request a seat. Calabrea also is seeking a seat and PARC submitted the following comment:

Melanie Pai, PARC – Protecting Arizona's Resources and Children

CAT takes community representation from homeowners associations, but excludes participation from organizations such as PARC which represents hundreds of citizens, from multiple communities, including those NOT represented by an HOA. PARC, Protecting Arizona's Resources and Children, is formally requesting participation in the SMCAT meetings.

PARC has requested a comprehensive, cumulative health study of ambient air quality and pollution effects on children attending schools of similar proximity as those 9,000 students attending school, including preschool, adjacent to the Pecos alignment.

CAT Member Questions and Comments:

Comment: Ahwatukee has good representation and can go to representatives such as Laurel.

Question: Have there been requests for more west side participation? **Response:** No.

Comment: It would be difficult to bring in new people at this point.

Comment: Will a no build be a west side vs. east side vote? **Response:** The group needs to consider the best decision from a regional point of view.

Comment: More voices are fine.

Comment: I don't want to rehash the work of the last three to four years of this committee.

Comment: As we get closer to decisions, people become more engaged. I would welcome additions to the committee. I am concerned about an east/west balance, which could be a problem later.

Comment: New groups are popping up all of the time. Where do you stop?

Gunn concluded that there was not strong support to adding members to the CAT. There was no disagreement with this statement. She noted that ADOT has offered to address any group that requests additional information, and that the CAT – as an advisory group – provides only one source of input to ADOT among many considerations.

Respond to Written Comments/Questions:

Comments and questions read during the meeting are recorded here verbatim from forms received.

William Ramsay

Question: Please clarify the status of Gila River Indian Community representatives on SMCAT. Is GRIC and related stakeholders – “alottees” – still represented? **Response:** GRIC representation is currently being researched. All communications with GRIC are through the ADOT Director's office at this time.

Question: Have any formal studies been conducted on the impact of dust to residential areas adjoining the proposed South Mountain Freeway created by blasting, excavating, grading, and razing of existing structures? What hazards exist in the dust? How many residents of Ahwatukee, Avondale, Tolleson, and Laveen would be impacted? What steps would ADOT take to mitigate this impact? **Response:** Studies relative to the impact of dust on neighboring communities are regulated under the Clean Air Act. The control of construction-related dust is regulated and permitted by Maricopa County and the contractor would be responsible for permit adherence. Dust-related impacts are defined under the Clean Air Act and are measured by size of particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}). Assessment of the number of residents affected by construction-related activities is not within to the scope of the study. Measures to mitigate will be defined in part by the Maricopa County permitting activities.

Melanie Pai, PARC – Protecting Arizona’s Resources and Children

Question: This SMCAT meeting location is not conducive to wide-spread citizen involvement. There is no voice amplification system, no ability for those who are not members of an HOA board to participate. How many citizens in apartments or non-HOA communities are participating the SMCAT meetings and in what capacity? Is it the view of ADOT that persons must own a home in order to participate in this process?

Response: CAT representation considers full coverage of the study area, including non-HOA organizations representing Valley-wide interests. Determination of future representation (additions or changes) is the subject of the CAT. The SMCAT meetings are open to public attendance for the purposes of observation only. The SMCAT has responsibility to determine the level of, public participation and whether it is warranted at this time. The SMCAT has elected to allow the public to attend meetings and to draft questions and comments for SMCAT consideration. Regarding the location, the SMCAT has determined it is adequate for SMCAT needs. Ways to improve voice amplification will be considered. Only 2 of the 22 members are HOA representatives. The others represent planning organizations, communities, or regional organizations. Home ownership is not required for membership.

Question: In telephone conference my organization has held with ADEQ, there was no mention of the Children’s Environmental Health Program personnel having any involvement with the ADOT planning processes. It is my understanding that state law and ADOT’s own defined process requires participation from this particular sub-group of ADEQ and organizations such as PACR, a citizen group comprised of those concerned about children attending school in such close proximity to the freeway. What efforts have been made to include PARC and the Children’s Environmental Health personnel from ADEQ? **Response:** ADOT is obligated to follow the process as set forth by the National Environmental Policy Act. The process allows for public input and public disclosure as implemented by the federal lead agency, Federal Highway Administration. ADEQ has been invited to participate in the process from the project outset through the agency scoping process.

Question: The American Academy of Pediatrics has concluded that freeways in close proximity to schools has a severe and clearly measurable impact on children’s health. How do the EPA EIS requirements account for these? What measures has ADOT taken to solicit participation from the American Lung Association, the American Academy of Pediatrics, and other organizations who could provide pertinent information on these relevant topics? **Response:** Data provided to the project team is reviewed and determined for applicability to the scope of the study. Consideration of input from such organizations is undertaken through issuance of Notice of Intent in the Federal Register, public and agency scoping, on-going coordination with public and agencies, data collection when conducting impact analyses, and public disclosure in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act.

Question: PARC, www.protectazchildren.org, has begun a petition due to the broad-based opposition to the freeway’s close proximity to nine thousand students at nine

schools. With such strong opposition by so many residents along the proposed Pecos alignment, and beyond, why are there not more specific data models being used to show citizens the levels of concentration of cancer-causing agents, respiratory irritants, etc., by their effects on the body? **Response:** The question is noted and has been taken under consideration.

Question: In California, building a freeway of such close proximity to schools as the proposed Pecos alignment would not be deemed legal at this juncture due to new legislation created to protect children. How has ADOT processes, reviewed, analyzed and considered these types of progress in development legislation for relevance in similar situations, such as the Pecos alignment? **Response:** The comment is noted and the details of the claim are under consideration. ADOT will follow the NEPA process and all pertinent environmental procedures when considering the comment and related question.

Question: Protection Arizona's Resources and Children formed specifically because ADOT was not receptive to our comments as individual citizens with regard to concerns about the health and well being of children attending school in close proximity to freeways. What recourse do individual citizens have on a continued basis, other than submitting comment cards, to ensure their voices will be heard with regard to pertinent issues? **Response:** Public comment can be provided through many venues such as the ADOT website. The public will have the opportunity to formally comment when the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is issued, which is anticipated to occur in late 2006.

Question: Are NEPA guidelines always deemed to be sufficient to gauge the needs of the community as it pertains to the health and safety of its citizens? Have there been prior instances where ADOT has taken additional measures, in addition to those defined in the NEPA process in order to protect the health and safety of persons in the community? **Response:** NEPA is required when a federally-funded project or a project that has a federal nexus is proposed. ADOT has worked with local jurisdictions and other agencies on project-related enhancements not deemed mitigation.

Question: How many schools will be located in a 1/2-1 miles proximity to each of the schools in the west side per each of the west-side proposed alignments? How many daycares? How many elder care facilities? **Response:** Some of these issues are covered in the Social Conditions report, which is available on the website (www.southmountainfreeway.com).

Question: The USEPA – Health Assessment Document for Diesel Engine Exhaust (2002) details specific impacts for children in residential areas and schools. What information and research data from sources such as these are included in the EIS? Does ADOT acknowledge that diesel engine exhaust poses a health risk to children attending school in close proximity to freeways? **Response:** ADOT has worked with local jurisdictions and other agencies on project-related enhancements not deemed mitigation. Air quality impacts are assessed by ADOT based upon federally established guidelines,

as established by the Environmental Protection Agency in accordance with Clean Air Act.

David Folts, Concerned Families Along South Mountain Loop 202

Question: Will constructing South Mountain Loop 202 substantially lessen grid lock (lessening exhaust emissions, pollution) on Broadway Curve I-10, Rte 17, Loop 101, Rte. 51 and if not, shouldn't improvements be made on the highways where the problems exist? Please include this question in the EIS. **Response:** Assessment of purpose and need for the South Mountain Freeway project takes into account all other planned transportation improvements (freeway and non-freeway). The assessment concluded that even with all such improvements, a need and a purpose for the South Mountain Freeway project exists.

Question: With proposed I-10 Reliever connection being made to proposed South Mountain Loop 202 and purposely constructed to relieve commercial traffic to South Mountain Loop 202, why isn't the effects from the volume of traffic from I-10 Reliever included in the South Mountain Loop 202 Environmental Impact Statement? With this added traffic from the I-10 Reliever increases from levels of vehicular exhaust along South Mountain Loop 202 would increase wouldn't this show more accurate data then without? **Response:** The I-10 Reliever (SR 801) proposed project is not for the purposes cited in the question. The South Mountain Freeway project does take into account the proposed SR 801 project.

Question: When construction starts on near or around West Van Buren WQARF is it possible for some of this contamination could travel to other aquifers or wells? Please include this question in the EIS. **Response:** Guidelines for disposal hazardous materials if encountered are set forth by federal regulation.

Question: If contamination does travel from the HDR Engineering identified Van Buren WQARF to other aquifers or wells isn't the proper way to check for this is through digging test wells and not through the monitoring process described earlier in this meeting. Please enter this question in the EIS Statement. **Response:** The characteristics of the WQARF site are well-documented and known. If it is determined that test wells are warranted, that will be presented in the EIS.

Question: Are the contaminants mentioned by HDR Engineering (Trichloroethelene, Dichlorethelene, etc.) above the U.S. limits for drinking water standards. If so, what are the present limits? Please enter this question in the South Mountain Loop EIS. **Response:** This data is not pertinent to the scope of the study.

Question: Could the contaminants mentioned by HDR Engineering in the (DEC, TCE, etc.) be considered liquid organics and if they are liquid organics, would they have a tendency to rest at the very bottom of the water hole? If they reside at the bottom of the

water table can they be reduced or removed? Please describe how this process works.

Response: This data is not pertinent to the scope of the study.

Question: Are the contaminants found in the WQARF Van Buren Site as identified by HDR Engineering considered carcinogens using U.S. or CA standards? Is one of the contaminants found in the WQARF Van Buren Site Perchloroethylene? Please enter this question in the South Mountain Loop 202 EIS. **Response:** This data is not pertinent to the scope of the study.

Question: A representative of HDR Engineering identified a WQARF site that had potential pesticides and herbicides in the water table. He also stated that the above mentioned HDR Rep also stated that many of these compounds break down on their own. What length of time is required for these contaminants to break down to 50 percent of original value in below grade water tables? Please identify each contaminant the start value and time required per contaminant. Please put this question in the South Mountain Loop 202 EIS. **Response:** This data is not pertinent to the scope of the study.

Question: What is the highest permissible noise measurement allowed in a resident's back yard once a highway is built? If the noise level is above this what action is taken to reduce this noise and what is the maximum time allowed for ADOT to remedy this situation? **Response:** Procedures to address post-construction activities and responsibilities were described at the meeting and will be presented in the EIS.

Question: What will be the average height of the wall on the north side of South Mountain Loop 202 between 32nd and 40th Street? How was this determined? **Response:** This information would be determined in design if a build alternative were approved.

Question: Will rubberized asphalt be used on South Mountain Loop 202 as it passes though Ahwatukee and if it is will this shorten the highway walls in Ahwatukee neighborhoods? **Response:** Rubberized asphalt is planned. It is premature to assess affects of such a measure on wall heights.

Question: Because South Mountain Loop 202 will serve as a natural bypass for commercial traffic around Phoenix could this highway be one of the noisiest in AZ or the U.S and if this is the case shouldn't this highway be the example for proper noise mitigation? **Response:** ADOT's Noise Policy is used in determination of noise mitigation. ADOT's policy is more stringent than current federal guidelines.

Question: How is highway noise mitigated on elevated sections of highway as in South Mountain Loop 202? **Response:** It will be done in accordance with ADOT Noise Policy as described in the meeting.

Question: Is it possible to point, put or bounce noise in a commercial area away from a residential area, i.e. noise is directed away from homes along a highway to a store parking lot or where factories reside. **Response:** This issue was previously discussed.

Question: What are allowable noise standards of AZ and U.S. along highways? If a homeowner thinks the noise level in his yard is above allowable limits, who will test and at what time frame must this be done? Does ADOT oversee the above-mentioned testing and pay the contractor who measures this noise? **Response:** Noise standards will be presented in the EIS. Procedures to address post-construction activities and responsibilities were described at the meeting and will be presented in the EIS.

Question: As traffic increases along South Mountain Loop 202 years after it is built will the noise also increase? If the noise does in fact increase who would the homeowner contact and if levels are found above allowable limits how long would it be before noise mitigation techniques were implemented? Are db measurement then taken again to estimate noise reduction? What is the average time frame for the above-mentioned process?

Response: Noise barriers when determined to be warranted are based upon volumes projected to occur during the design year, in this case, 2030.

Question: I heard mentioned that FHWA will not provide funds for a highway project that will not connect from the east to the west, i.e. the west side of the highway stops at South Mountain Park the east side of the highway stops at South Mountain Park. Who from the FHWA made this decision? **Response:** The issue of logical termini and independent utility is a function of the National Environmental Policy Act.

Question: When considering build vs. no-build, be sure to include the effects on air quality. **Response:** Comment noted.

Ralph Guariglio

Question: 1) Will there be any restrictions on hazardous material (dangerous goods) on hazardous waste transportation on this freeway? 2) What happens to all the earth that will be removed from South Mountain and from the other areas where the freeway might be constructed/depressed? **Response:** Restrictions for transporting hazardous materials are not planned for on the South Mountain Freeway. The freeway is designed generally with a goal to balance cut and fill. If excess material occurs, it will be disposed of at approved disposal sites.

Teri Pinkstaff

Comment: How much of our tax dollars has and will be wasted determining the route of a highway that may then be determined to no-build. What a waste to put the cart before the horse. **Response:** Comment noted.

Daniel D. Pinkstaff, 17010 S. 34th Street

Comment: Another giant government boondoggle, start talking to the Indians now! Why does ADOT go public with this information when it's incomplete? ADOT employees appear to be rude misinformed and uncaring. **Response:** Comment noted.

CAT Member Comment Cards

Statements shown below are recorded verbatim from comment cards.

Questions/Comments

- What would/has Phoenix looked at to mitigate noise if no freeway? Along Pecos.
- In the Co-Nexus process, are there any scenarios under which it would point to no-build?
- On the 20+ sites ranked high/medium, please briefly detail what makes them such.
- We should not exclude any group that wants a seat at the table – consultants have been good at controlling meetings – let process go forward with those who want to engage.
- When do we see the induced traffic data in report format as promised?
- Please remind us of why we can't have parkways and transit as an option in detail. Please include detailed answer in the meeting summary.
- Please speak to entire committee, not narrowing your vision to one or two individuals.

Adjourn:

Next CAT Meeting

The next CAT meeting will be held Thursday, January 19, 2006 at 5:30 p.m. at the Learning Center Meeting Hall, Komatke Center, in District Six. Upcoming meetings include January 26 and February 2. The February 2nd agenda will include the evaluation.

(Provided by Michele Pulich-Stewart.)

South Mountain Freeway
Sierra Club
Palo Verde Group
January 3, 2006

The Palo Verde Group of the Sierra Club supports the No-Build Alternative for the proposed South Mountain Freeway for the following reasons:

- The freeway will impact at least 40 acres of South Mountain Park, but no off-site mitigation is being proposed to compensate the Phoenix Park system. With burgeoning increases in population and sprawl development taking more of our natural desert area, adding at least the same amount of parkland elsewhere would mitigate impacts to parks. If visual impacts and impacts from noise were considered in the mitigation process, additional acreage should be provided.
- The freeway will exacerbate air quality problems for residents living in the area.
- There is no major transit component being considered as an alternative to the freeway. A transit alternative would reduce air pollution and provide another way for East Valley and West Valley residents to access other parts of the Valley. Freeways divide neighborhoods; transit can help bring them together.
- The freeway will create a major impediment to movement of wildlife from the Gila Indian Reservation to South Mountain Park. The proposal includes no serious mitigation measures for impacts to wildlife.
- The freeway will impact cultural sites. Several tribes have indicated sacred sites exist on South Mountain and these sites will be negatively affected by the freeway. The freeway will also affect how runoff from South Mountain reaches the Gila River, further affecting cultural sites.